



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is written from the standpoint of the subject and of scholarship rather than with an eye single to the student and the class-room.

CHARLES E. PERSONS.

Washington University.

Current Economic Problems. A Series of Readings in the Control of Industrial Development. Edited by WALTON HALE HAMILTON. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1915. Pp. xxxix, 789. \$2.75.)

Exercises in Current Economics. By WALTON HALE HAMILTON. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1916. Pp. xii, 105. \$.50.)

These *Readings*, and the *Exercises* which Professor Hamilton has prepared to be used with them, reflect unmistakably the idea that the inductive method is the best one to use in the teaching of economics. Two questions assert their right to consideration, at the outset, in any judgment of the book. First, Is the inductive method, alone, without the use of any text except a book of readings (backed up by printed problems and questions), the most economical and effective method? and secondly, granting that it may be, Is this book, in the hands of the average teacher, likely to be a suitable instrument and medium of instruction?

The reviewer is torn between admiration of Professor Hamilton's industry and his ferret-like power to smell out stimulating passages in the most obscure byways of economic literature—and some that is not economic—and a feeling that somehow this industry and the undoubted keen analytical power behind it would have been turned to better advantage had they been directed to the production of an original book. Professor Hamilton, under a natural, but perhaps extreme, reaction against the conventional methods of economics instruction, has gathered together 382 selections, varying in length from a few lines to a very few pages (the average length is $2 \frac{1}{3}$ pages), divided into 96 subgroups, and 14 chapters. At the very start of his introduction, he raises the old question, but certainly one which is philosophically and practically fundamental to any constructive social science today, whether there are "problems" or only a "social problem." His *selections* deal with "problems"; scarcely, if at all, with the social, or economic, problem—perhaps because so little has been written in economic literature from the viewpoint that society is an organic whole. But *his own viewpoint* is that of the unity of

all economic processes and relations. Speaking of the questions covered by the selections, he says that "as separate problems they are merely aspects of a larger reality . . . each involves something of almost every phase of our complicated life." And again, "their essential unity makes the word 'problems' in the title unfortunate." "The object of this volume," he says, "is to present *a general view of the whole as a necessary preliminary to the study of particular problems.*"¹

The book is thus paradoxical. The solution of the paradox can be found only in the personality and ability of the teacher. The editor's own main introduction and his chapter introductions are admirable in their content, and especially in their design to link the material together. But in and of themselves they are far from adequate to any such task. It is just here that the main question as to the validity and desirability of an inductive method, rigidly adhered to, comes. Can the student, no matter how able the teacher, or how small the class, get from "readings" and class discussions, without the aid of a unifying text and piloting and summarizing lectures in some considerable number, anything like a conception of the unity of social problems, or much of that ability at *continuous* thought, driving through to essentials, which is absolutely necessary if economists are to be very far ahead of the superficial journalistic enthusiast in their treatment of vital questions? One cannot escape the fear that a book of abbreviated paragraphs may have much the same influence as our American newspaper and popular magazine—to aid still further in the destruction of what little power of sustained attention and thought our choppy and overloaded public school curriculum has left us.

The fundamental adverse criticism is, then, *cui bono?* And this is directed not at Professor Hamilton's avowed purpose, which is right, but at the means he has chosen—or perhaps it is the rather a criticism of the whole conception of the purpose, if there be a purpose, which actuates the teaching of economics in this country. We start off with the "antecedents of modern industrialism." Very good—we need a historical background. Then we study the industrial revolution, and pass to social control in modern industrialism. Here, glancing at the "nature of progress" in passing, we read some thirty selections, the main tenor of which is the conflict between *laissez faire* and state control. Then we take up "the pecuniary basis of economic organization." Thus

¹ Italics the reviewer's.

far a sense of unity and continuity of economic phenomena does not desert us. But from here on that sense is largely missing. We apparently relapse into specific study of specific problems—the business cycle, international trade, railway regulation, monopoly, population, economic insecurity, trade unionism, social reform, and taxation. The list reads like the table of contents of the “applied” part of any text in economics; and suggests the thought that most of our texts and courses finally get lost in a maze of details. Suppose a student gives a year to these 90-odd topics and subtopics. If he is going on to advanced courses in economics, does he need this sort of sight-seeing trip through all the beaten highways of economic “problems”? We leave this unanswered. *But if he is not going on, this is not the kind of pabulum he should have.* This is true whether this book is to be used in the introductory course or in a second survey course. Somewhere in our teaching of economics we ought to lead the student out of the trees and give him a view of the forest. Sometime, amid all the welter of specific problems, he should be led to consider political economy, social economy, *world* economy, in those large wholes, and in that wide perspective, which alone can make the study of social science really constructive.

The reviewer cannot escape the fact that the average college student's time is limited to four years, that our high school curriculum, in its lack of adaptation to the modern fundamentals of a social education, does not equip the student either with knowledge or interest to think about social problems, let alone “the social problem,” and that, moreover, the college curriculum itself is cluttered with requirements of logical and traditional, but doubtful, value, when measured by the demands society must make upon knowledge and mental vision. Social science departments should aim first of all not at the production of special experts, even in embryo, nor yet at the orientation of the student in every social and economic problem that happens to be troubling the community, but at bringing the student to a consciousness of the irony of the world situation and to a search for its causes. Unless we, teachers and students alike, make a mighty attempt to see economic and economico-moral situations and values not only in national but, far more, in world perspective, we might nearly as well convert our social science departments into business colleges—a tendency which has already gained gratifying headway.

Professor Hamilton will doubtless be the first to agree with this

conviction. We are questioning the purpose and the vision of economics teaching as a whole, not Professor Hamilton's purpose. But we do question his method and his medium, and doubt whether very many teachers will be found capable of making them really work. One thing is sure: such a book will either have to be used without a text and made practically the whole basis for discussion (in which case the chances are, under any ordinary teacher, that the student's knowledge and grasp of economic problems will be like the book, exceedingly choppy) or, if used as reading collateral to a text, the student will be baffled and confused by the array put before him. It was perhaps a feeling that this difficulty might be encountered that led Professor Hamilton to prepare the book of exercises.

It would perhaps be an exaggeration to say that the European war, partially revealing as it has the insecurity and hollowness of our social organization and the illusory character of what we call civilization, has rendered every text in social science thus far published out of date—but it would not be a very great exaggeration. Let us hope that Professor Hamilton will have early opportunity to revise or enlarge this book. Then may we not expect him to give over his conventional treatment of international trade and include some selections to point the way to the relation of trade rivalry to diplomacy and war. And to include a longish chapter on consumption? And to indicate that the "control of industrial development" is wrapped up with the psychology of profits, of nationalism, of materialism?

A. B. WOLFE.

University of Texas.

NEW BOOKS

BIZZELL, W. B. *The social teachings of the Jewish prophets; a study in biblical sociology.* (Boston: Sherman, French. 1916. Pp. 237. \$1.25.)

FETTER, F. A. *Modern economic problems. Economics*, vol. II. Part I. *Resources and economic organization.* (New York: Century Co. 1916. Pp. xi, 498. \$1.75.)

To be reviewed.

FETTER, F. A. *Manual of references and exercises in economics for use with volume I, "Economic principles."* (New York: Century Co. 1916. Pp. 46.)

GILL, C. *National power and prosperity. A study of the economic causes of modern warfare.* (London: Unwin. 1916. Pp. xxxvii, 81.)

KELSEY, C. *The physical basis of society*. (New York: Appleton. 1916. Pp. xiii, 406. \$2.)

To be reviewed.

KLEENE, G. A. *Profit and wages. A study in the distribution of income*. (New York: Macmillan. 1916. Pp. iv, 171.)

To be reviewed.

O'HARA, F. *Introduction to economics*. (New York: Macmillan. 1916. Pp. vii, 259. \$1.)

PARSONS, E. C. *Social rule*. (New York: Putnams. 1916.)

RUSSELL, B. *Principles of social reconstruction*. (London: Allen & Unwin. 1916. 6s.)

RYAN, J. A. *Distributive justice. The right and wrong of our present distribution of wealth*. (New York: Macmillan. 1916. Pp. xviii, 442. \$1.50.)

To be reviewed.

SCHELLE, G. *L'économie politique et les économistes, avec une introduction sur l'économique et la guerre*. (Paris: Doin. 1916. Pp. 400. 6 fr.)

TREVER, A. A. *A history of Greek economic thought*. (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 1916. Pp. 161. 75c.)

The author well says in his short preface which dates the volume (November 1, 1915) that a study like his of Greek economic theory may serve the double purpose of awakening Greek scholars to phases of Greek thought too little regarded by them and of reminding modern economists how much they have in common with the Greeks. In economic histories it is certainly the difference rather than the common element that receives emphasis.

The ground has probably never been surveyed so thoroughly by an English or American writer, nor even by any foreigner. Dr. Trever confesses his own sympathy with the general attitude of Greek writers towards economic subjects, so far as their writings can be said to show a general attitude. To use his own words he "reinterprets Greek economic theory in the light of our modern humanitarian economy" (preface). The latter turns out to mean broadly the economic views of Ruskin; and criticism of Dr. Trever in the matter of first principles would be the criticism usually directed by economists against Ruskin. Our author's adhesion is not indiscriminating (see pp. 64 and 92, note), but to some of us his estimate of Ruskin will have the same exaggeration as Ruskin's estimate of Xenophon (p. 64). It is "to be remembered at the same time that the expositor is not called upon to set forth his own positive views fully. We have the materials fully presented for our own judgment. Even the minor works and authors are gathered in.

The printer has served our author well. In the numerous Greek quotations the slips are few and not vital. The projected history